



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,181	11/10/2003	Ian D. Hegerty	5598/154US	4662

7590 08/11/2005

Seth Ostrow  
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder and Steiner LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-4728

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/705,181	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HEGERTY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ranodhi Serrao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 November 2003 and 28 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/10/2003</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities: "inlinking" is misspelled in line 9 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 16, 17, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the inlinks" in lines 5 and 9 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the unique inlinking hosts" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. Claim 17 recites the limitation "the non-global host" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the same country code top-level domain" in line 10 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. Claim 23 recites the limitation "the same country code top-level domain" in line 6 of the claim and recites "the non-global unique inlinking hosts" in line 8 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weiner et al. (6,701,317).

11. As per claim 22, Weiner et al. teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country, comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following are true (col. 13, lines 6-17): there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains (col. 14, lines 6-15), there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (col. 8, lines 48-65), and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain (col. 14, lines 26-33).

12. As per claim 23, Weiner et al. teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country, comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following three tests are true (col. 13, lines 6-17): there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain (col. 14, lines 26-33), a particular country code

Art Unit: 2141

top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value (col. 8, lines 48-65).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-10, 12-16, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (6,526,426) and Wiener et al. (6,701,317).

15. As per claim 1, Lakritz teaches a method of determining a countrytag for a website on a network (see Lakritz, col. 3, line 6-col. 4, line 11), comprising: determining a first set of hosts that have country code domains (see Lakritz, col. 35, lines 63-64); determining which hosts of websites on the network are of interest to users in a particular geographical location (see Lakritz, col. 5, lines 3-11); determining which of the websites on the network is of interest to users in a particular geographical location (see Lakritz, col. 5, lines 3-11). However, Lakritz fails to teach a method of looking at the inlinks from the first set of hosts; adding the hosts determined to be of interest to the first set of hosts to create an augmented set of hosts; and, by looking at the inlinks from the augmented set of hosts. Wiener et al. teaches a method of looking at the inlinks from the first set of hosts (see Wiener et al., col. 10, lines 49-60); adding the hosts

determined to be of interest to the first set of hosts to create an augmented set of hosts (see Wiener et al., col. 14, lines 48-57); and, by looking at the inlinks from the augmented set of hosts (see Wiener et al., col. 17, lines 39-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lakritz to a method of looking at the inlinks from the first set of hosts; adding the hosts determined to be of interest to the first set of hosts to create an augmented set of hosts; and, by looking at the inlinks from the augmented set of hosts in order to fully realize the capabilities and advantages of constructing a server that collects, arranges, and stores data that defines the connectivity of web pages (see Wiener et al., col. 6, lines 25-43).

16. As per claims 2, 4, 5, 19, 20, and 21, the above motivation of claim 1 applies fully in order to combine Lakritz and Wiener et al.

17. As per claim 2, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, wherein the country code domain of the first set of hosts is a top-level domain. However, Lakritz teaches a method, wherein the country code domain of the first set of hosts is a top-level domain (col. 21, lines 33-39).

18. As per claim 4, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, wherein the network is the Internet. However, Lakritz teaches a method, wherein the network is the Internet (col. 9, lines 57-63).

19. As per claim 5, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, wherein the network is an intranet.

Art Unit: 2141

However, Laktriz teaches a method, wherein the network is an intranet (col. 9, lines 57-63).

20. As per claim 19, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, further including determining a countrytag for a web subsite. However, Laktriz teaches a method, further including determining a countrytag for a web subsite (col. 6, lines 28-42).

21. As per claim 20, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, wherein a different test is used to determine if a website should be assigned a "US" countrytag that is used for assigning countrytags of non-US countries. However, Lakritz teaches a method, wherein a different test is used to determine if a website should be assigned a "US" countrytag that is used for assigning countrytags of non-US countries (col. 48, lines 1-13).

22. As per claim 21, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, wherein a website can be assigned more than one countrytag. However, Laktriz teaches a method, wherein a website can be assigned more than one countrytag (col. 25, lines 19-21).

23. As per claim 3, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Laktriz fails to teach a method, further comprising: crawling the network to gather information about the pages or sites in the network, including the top-level domain and connectivity of the crawled sites. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, further comprising: crawling the network to gather information about the pages or sites in the network, including the top-level domain and connectivity of the crawled sites (see

Art Unit: 2141

Wiener et al., col. 5, lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Laktriz to a method, further comprising: crawling the network to gather information about the pages or sites in the network, including the top-level domain and connectivity of the crawled sites in order to provide detailed information to users that pose queries in an internal format of the connectivity server (see Wiener et al., col. 6, lines 46-55).

24. As per claim 6, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Laktriz fails to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the first set of hosts further looks at inlinks to globally hosted websites. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the first set of hosts further looks at inlinks to globally hosted websites (see Wiener et al., col. 5, lines 17-36). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Laktriz to a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the first set of hosts further looks at inlinks to globally hosted websites in order to provide linkage information for a significant portion of the Web (see Wiener et al., col. 5, lines 46-55).

25. As per claim 7, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Laktriz fails to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the augmented set of hosts further looks at inlinks and outlinks to globally hosted websites. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the augmented set of hosts further looks at inlinks and outlinks to globally hosted websites (see Wiener et al., col. 10, lines 49-60). It would

Art Unit: 2141

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Laktriz to a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the augmented set of hosts further looks at inlinks and outlinks to globally hosted websites in order to provide linkage information for a significant portion of the Web (see Wiener et al., col. 5, lines 46-55).

26. As per claim 8, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Laktriz fails to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the first set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following are true: there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the first set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following are true (see Wiener et al., col. 13, lines 6-17): there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains (see Wiener et al., col. 14, lines 6-15), there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (see Wiener et al., col. 8, lines 48-65), and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain (see Wiener et al., col. 14, lines 26-33). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Laktriz to a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the first set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following are true: there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain in order to allow servers to maintain accurate linkage information for a significant portion of the Web and support a large number of client users that desire numerous variants of connectivity information (see Wiener et al., col. 2, lines 46-56).

27. As per claim 9, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 8, but Laktriz fails to teach a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 (see Wiener et al., col. 12, lines 15-26: wherein K may be any integer greater than 0). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Laktriz to a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 in order to allow servers to maintain accurate linkage information for a significant portion of the Web and support a large number of client users that desire numerous variants of connectivity information (see Wiener et al., col. 2, lines 46-56).

28. As per claim 10, Laktriz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 8, but Laktriz fails to teach a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60%. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60% (see Wiener et al., col. 14, lines 26-33). It would have

Art Unit: 2141

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lakritz to a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60% in order to vastly reduce the disk space and processing time required to sort a set of URLs (see Wiener et al., col. 13, lines 56-67).

29. As per claim 12, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7, but Wiener et al. fails to teach a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the host is marked for manual countrytagging. However, Lakritz teaches a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the host is marked for manual countrytagging (see Lakritz, col. 4, lines 27-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wiener et al. to a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the host is marked for manual countrytagging in order to allow the most appropriate language of a requested document to be served to a Web browser (see Lakritz, col. 15, lines 59-61).

30. As per claim 13, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but Lakritz fails to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the augmented set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following three tests are true: there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the determining

step that looks at inlinks from the augmented set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following three tests are true (see Wiener et al., col. 13, lines 6-17): there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain (see Wiener et al., col. 14, lines 26-33), a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value (see Wiener et al., col. 8, lines 48-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lakritz to a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks from the augmented set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following three tests are true: there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value in order to allow servers to maintain accurate linkage information for a significant portion of the Web and support a large number of client users that desire numerous variants of connectivity information (see Wiener et al., col. 2, lines 46-56).

31. As per claim 14, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 13, but Lakritz fails to teach a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40%. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the first

Art Unit: 2141

predetermined percentage is 40% (see Wiener et al., col. 17, lines 25-37). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lakritz to a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40% in order to vastly reduce the disk space and processing time required to sort a set of URLs (see Wiener et al., col. 13, lines 56-67).

32. As per claim 15, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 13, but Lakritz fails to teach a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32%. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32% (see Wiener et al., col. 17, lines 25-37: wherein it would be obvious to change 40% to 32%). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lakritz to a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32% in order to vastly reduce the disk space and processing time required to sort a set of URLs (see Wiener et al., col. 13, lines 56-67).

33. As per claim 16, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7, but Lakritz fails to teach a method, further comprising: before the determining step, summing the unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set. However, Wiener et al. teaches a method, further comprising: before the determining step, summing the unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set (see Wiener et al., col. 15, lines 6-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lakritz to a method, further comprising: before the determining step, summing the unique inlinking

Art Unit: 2141

hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set in order to fully realize the capabilities and advantages of constructing a server that collects, arranges, and stores data that defines the connectivity of web pages (see Wiener et al., col. 6, lines 25-43).

34. Claims 11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (6,526,426) and Wiener et al. (6,701,317) as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Page (6,285,999).

35. As per claim 11, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7, but fail to teach a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the root or default document page exists in one and only on ODP country section. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the root or default document page exists in one and only on ODP country section (see Page, col. 6, line 61-col. 7, line 21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Page to a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the root or default document page exists in one and only on ODP country section in order to avoid spam and failure to retrieve desired documents (see Page, col. 1, lines 51-67).

36. As per claim 17, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7, but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of the non-global host suggests that country. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of the non-global host suggests that country (see

Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Page to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of the non-global host suggests that country in order to further improve and increase the performance of documents whose backlinks are maintained by different institutions and authors in various geographic locations (see Page, col. 7, lines 22-27).

37. As per claim 18, Lakritz and Wiener et al. teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7, but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country (see Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Page to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country in order to further improve and increase the performance of documents whose backlinks are maintained by different institutions and authors in various geographic locations (see Page, col. 7, lines 22-27).

### ***Conclusion***


38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notice of References Cited

and teach numerous other ways of implementing countrytagging, thus a close review of them is suggested.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER